

**CHANNEL ISLANDS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY ADVISORY COUNCIL**  
***Marine Shipping Working Group Meeting***

**Key Outcomes**  
**January 7, 2016**  
**Channel Islands Maritime Museum**  
**3900 Bluefin Circle, Oxnard, CA**

**Attendance**

- Fifteen Marine Shipping Working Group (MSWG) members (or alternates) participated in the 5th MSWG meeting. See attached attendance roster.

**Welcome and Agenda Review**

Eric Poncelet and Janet Thomson, Kearns & West Facilitators, opened the meeting with a discussion of the working group process. They explained that the advice packet that was distributed to the MSWG prior to this meeting is still in a draft format, including many members' raw comments and revisions. Thus, one of the primary objectives of the fifth MSWG meeting was to discuss and revise the advice packet, and develop a plan for creating a final draft to be forwarded to the full Sanctuary Advisory Council at the March 2016 meeting.

**Informational Presentations**

***International Maritime Organization Process***

Stephanie Altman, NOAA General Counsel, gave a presentation explaining the timeline and implementation for International Maritime Organization (IMO) measures. Recommendations for a new measure or amending an existing measure coming out of this process would funnel up to NOAA through the sanctuary program and on to the other members of the US Delegation to the IMO, which includes the US Coast Guard, Dept. of the Navy, Dept. of State and the Environmental Protection Agency. Proposals would need to be sent to the IMO three months prior to the IMO meeting. Stephanie highlighted that if a routing measure is approved by the IMO, implementation would not begin for at least six months but could be longer. She explained that the Coast Guard is the lead agency in charge of the rule-making of said measure. Stephanie explained the reasoning behind designating an area as a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA) is to elevate the importance of an area. She then compared the draft timeline for a PSSA using an existing measure or a PSSA with a new associated protective measure. Her full presentation can be found here: [http://channelislands.noaa.gov/sac/group\\_meetings\\_archives.html](http://channelislands.noaa.gov/sac/group_meetings_archives.html)

***NOAA Economic Analysis***

Sarah Gonyo, NOAA's National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NCCOS), presented preliminary findings on the economic impacts of shipping based on location and speed of cargo ships. To determine the economic effects of different shipping routes, NCCOS used Automatic Identification System routing data and fuel and inventory costs. The findings are preliminary, and there will be more to report using this model at the March 2016 SAC meeting. She answered many questions regarding the specific inputs to the model and stressed that it can incorporate different parameters. Sarah's full presentation can be found here: [http://channelislands.noaa.gov/sac/group\\_meetings\\_archives.html](http://channelislands.noaa.gov/sac/group_meetings_archives.html)

***Parameters for Whale Impact Analysis***

Jessica Redfern presented the parameters she is using for a whale ship strike impact analysis that addresses the risk to whales of dispersed versus concentrated vessel traffic. She explained that her previous analysis assessed risk in five tracks with concentrated vessel traffic, and now she plans to analyze the risk in those tracks compared to dispersed traffic that is not confined to a defined route. She noted that the risk

assessment will estimate co-occurrence of ships and whales for dispersed and concentrated traffic south of the northern Channel Islands from 2008-2014. Whale data used in the analysis will be from existing data sets. Ship speed could also potentially be input into the analysis in the future. Jessica is planning to present this risk assessment at the SAC meeting in March 2016. Jessica's full presentation is available here:

[http://channelislands.noaa.gov/sac/group\\_meetings\\_archives.html](http://channelislands.noaa.gov/sac/group_meetings_archives.html)

### ***Preliminary Shipping Patterns in Whale Advisory Zones***

Ryan Freedman, Research Operations Specialist at the sanctuary, gave a brief presentation showing preliminary findings on vessel cooperation with the voluntary 10 knot speed recommendation that NOAA recommended in a Vessel Speed Reduction zone within the Santa Barbara Channel in the summer of 2015. He showed the daily average ship speeds in this area to be higher than 10 knots. He noted that some ships appeared to have cooperated with the 10 knot advisory, but most are not. Of the roughly 500 ships that transited through the WAZ in the summer of 2015, 50 ships were moving at around 10 knots; close to 40 of the 50 ships travel at or below 10 knots on average. The data also suggest, in general, that average ship speed is coming down, just not to the suggested 10 knots. Ryan will continue to analyze the data.

### **Discuss and Complete MSWG Advice Package**

Eric Poncelet and Janet Thomson then initiated a discussion about the MSWG advice package. They explained the main goals were to clarify views on edits and current texts as well as to recommend refinements and to build level of support section. The working group commented on the outreach/education and research sections as well as the management measures in general. The working group then provided comments specifically in reference to the technology-based proposal and the spatial proposal.

### ***Discussion of Outreach and Education Section***

- Many members believed that education and outreach should be ongoing.
- Some stated that an in-depth discussion of funding sources for outreach and education ideas was missing, and that the list of ideas should be prioritized.
- The group discussed the challenges of collecting and disseminating whale information in a way that actually results in a ship changing behavior to reduce risk of ship strikes. Members noted that it is essential to identify who should receive whale location information, how they should receive it, and how to determine the effectiveness of the outreach.
- Working group members discussed AIS text messaging to disseminate whale location information to mariners, including:
  - Concerns with how best to package whale information in AIS text messages for mariners.
  - Too many AIS whale warnings may overload the system, overburden the Marine Exchange of Southern California (Mx SoCal), and distract the mariner.
  - The issue of language barriers, as ships are coming from different countries may present a problem with information dissemination.
  - Must consider the best time to relay information, before or during ship transit, to avoid strikes and distracting mariners.
  - Captain Kip Louttit (Mx SoCal) clarified that AIS text messages can be sent one-to-one to decrease overload to system, and that all vessels of concern to the MSWG have AIS text messaging capabilities. He also noted that AIS is not the only tool available; most ships have email which could also be used to contact mariners.
  - The working group may recommend drafting a letter to the FCC requesting that Mx SoCal be approved to send AIS text messages to ships to report whale sightings.

### ***Discussion of Research Section***

- The working group discussed the need to fill certain data gaps and to prioritize data collection that is most needed to help inform management decisions.

- Some stated that research should not replace the need for immediate management actions but rather work in concert with management.
- Some expressed the view that the research scope of the MSWG document is too narrow, and it should be explicitly noted in the document that the research ideas currently contained in the document relate primarily to the technology-based proposal, and do not reflect the full spectrum of possible research needs.
- One member suggested including the use of drones from NASA for whale and ship monitoring.
- Some raised questions of how funding and prioritization will work for all of these ideas.
- Some noted that the difficulty around acoustic monitoring in this region is not adequately captured in the document.

#### ***Discussion of Management Measures in General***

- Many members agreed that it is important to look at a timeline of these management options and prioritize what actions can occur now.
- Pros and cons must be based on concrete research; some of the identified pros and cons do not have any references.
- Some members want management options to be based on the most recent data, as they feel that shipping trends are changing. Shipping industry members predict there will be a decrease in number of ships because ships are getting larger and able to carry more cargo. It was also mentioned that ships are expected to be cleaner and that recent emissions inventories will be very different than in 2005. Some members asked about acquiring data on the speeds of these larger ships, and were told by shipping industry representatives that bigger ships have significantly slower cruising speeds than their predecessors.
- There was unanimous support for another voluntary vessel speed reduction (VSR) incentive trial put together by the Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District (SBCAPCD) and CINMS as long as it is carefully worded.

#### **Discuss Technology-Based and Spatial Proposals**

Sanctuary staff highlighted the recent revisions that were made to the working group's advice package in order to reflect comments and feedback submitted by working group members in the last drafting phase. Currently, there is no explicit discussion in the draft advice package on how these proposals fit into the four goals of the working group. It was recommended by the group that staff make additional revisions to show how ideas fit within the goals of the process.

There was broad agreement within the group that the document needed a re-write to organize and clarify the process and outcomes of the MSWG. Working group members also agreed that there was a lot of repetition throughout the document and confusion on the levels of support for specific ideas or whole proposals. Members expressed two main ideas on structuring the final document. Some felt that each idea, whether an outreach/education, research, or management idea, should stand alone, while others felt that the two proposals should be the main focus of the document. Some members explained that they see these proposals as competing, while other members did not feel this way. Group members highlighted the need for an executive summary to explain the process as well as the where the group agreed and disagreed. The group discussed both proposals as well as specific changes to level of support sections.

#### ***Discussion of Technology-Based Approach***

- The research, outreach, and education ideas sections and the technology-based approach need to be streamlined to make sure that all of the pros, cons, and considerations are consistent and repetition is minimized.
- The SBCAPCD representative noted that this proposal focused on avoiding whales but does not have any explicit air quality benefits. She does not want to oppose anything within the technology

based proposal but needs a way to express that there are no air quality benefits of this approach and therefore it is not an optimal solution should it stand alone.

- Members discussed how to articulate their level of support for ideas in the document. For example, some members liked certain aspects of the technology-based approach, but could not support the entire proposal as a management tool.
- There was discussion of the type of information that would be put into a whale data repository. Some members noted that the type of data collected by mariners would not be adequate to support scientific modeling or to fill data gaps. The Navy representative offered that aerial monitoring data could be used to fill in data gaps.

### ***Discussion of Spatial Approach***

- Proposal proponents clarified that this approach was written in a way so that all proposed routing measures are linked.
- There was discussion of the priority level of a Particularly Sensitive Sea Area (PSSA) designation. Members agreed it would be a lengthy process, and that it is not a high priority.
- Working group members expressed broad support for extending the Area to be Avoided (ATBA), yet there was disagreement about the need for the expanded southwest corner of the ATBA. A few members explained that the southwest corner has a lot of shipping traffic, and they questioned the needed size of the ATBA based on existing whale data. Overlaid whale species distribution maps showed how the ATBA covers those ranges. Some MSWG members noted that there is a risk that if the southwest corner is cut off, ships will continue up the coast in a high whale density/high risk area near the shelf break. The Navy representative explained that cutting off the southwest corner would increase the Navy's level of support for this specific measure. The NOAA representative explained it would be hard to go to the IMO with proposed changes to the ATBA when the US government has not fully completed the most recent changes to the current Traffic Separation Scheme.
- The Navy expressed concern with the Western route as it may hinder the Navy's ability to divert shipping traffic when needed. Working group members discussed how to address this concern, including adding language to the IMO routing measure that acknowledges the overlap of the proposed Western route and the Sea Range. NOAA General Counsel explained that it is unknown at this time if this would be possible.
- There was disagreement over the appropriate speed for a VSR program. Some members supported 12 knots, while others believed that 10 knots was more appropriate for whale conservation. The group then discussed the comparative safety concerns of each of these speeds for both mariners and whales.
- Working group members expressed a desire for more analysis of risk to whales, specifically the dispersed versus concentrated ship routing study, to make an informed decision about the western route.
- The NOAA IMO representative explained the difficulty of creating an international VSR as an IMO measure, adding that it may be easier to implement it as a domestic rule; but it would only apply to US-flagged vessels.
- The group discussed the possibility of having a VSR enforced as a condition of port entry into Los Angeles/Long Beach.

### **Next Steps**

The facilitators explained that sanctuary staff will re-work the document and circulate it for edits and comments to working group members. Staff will send the revised document to the SAC by March 11<sup>th</sup> for consideration at the March 18<sup>th</sup> SAC meeting.

Staff directed members to go through the individual subcomponents and state their level of support once the next draft is circulated. There was discussion about how the level of support section within the document should be structured. Most members agreed that there should be a way for members to both state and explain their level of support.

Support staff asked members to participate in a post-process evaluation that is designed to improve these processes in the future.

Sanctuary staff and the working group co-chairs shared final thoughts and expressed gratitude for the hard work accomplished by the working group.

**Meeting Attendance Roster (January 7, 2016)**

Cassidy Teufel	CA Coastal Commission	<i>Present</i>
John Calambokidis	Cascadia Research	<i>Present</i>
Angela Szesciorka	Cascadia Reserch (Alternate)	<i>Absent</i>
Kathy Metcalf	Chamber of Shipping of America	<i>Present</i>
Sean Kline	Chamber of Shipping of America (Alternate)	<i>Absent</i>
Stephen Whitaker	Channel Islands National Park	<i>Present</i>
Kristi Birney (Co-Chair)	Environmental Defense Center	<i>Present</i>
Andrea Mills	Island Packers	<i>Present</i>
Jeromy McConnell	Maersk Line	<i>Absent</i>
Lee Kindberg	Maersk Line (alternate)	<i>Absent</i>
Capt. Kip Louttit	Marine Exchange of Southern California	<i>Present</i>
Jessica Redfern	National Marine Fisheries Service	<i>Present</i>
Penny Ruvelas	National Marine Fisheries Service	<i>Present</i>
Megan McKenna	National Park Service	<i>Absent</i>
Zak Smith	Natural Resources Defense Council	<i>Present</i>
Taryn Kiekow	Natural Resources Defense Council (alternate)	<i>Absent</i>
TL Garrett	Pacific Merchant Shipping Association	<i>Present</i>
John Berge	Pacific Merchant Shipping Association (alternate)	<i>Absent</i>
Mary Byrd	Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District	<i>Present</i>
Joseph Petrini	Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District	<i>Absent</i>
LT Jevon James	U.S. Coast Guard	<i>Absent</i>
LCDR Brandon Link	U.S. Coast Guard (alternate)	<i>Present</i>
John Ugoretz	Dept. of Defense - U.S. Navy	<i>Present</i>
Walt Schobel	Dept. Of Defense (alternate)	<i>Absent</i>
Phyllis Grifman	USC Sea Grant	<i>Present</i>
James Fawcett	USC Sea Grant	<i>Present</i>

Also in attendance: Chris Jeffrey, National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NOAA); Sarah Gonyo, National Centers for Coastal Ocean Science (NOAA); Stephanie Altman, NOAA's Office of General Counsel; sanctuary staff Chris Mobley, Sean Hastings, Morgan Visalli, Elena Meza, and Jen Bone; SeaSketch staff Grace Goldberg; and Kearns & West facilitators Janet Thomson and Eric Poncelet.

## Final Agenda

### Marine Shipping Working Group – Meeting #5

#### Channel Islands National Marine Sanctuary Advisory Council

January 7, 2016 (10:00 AM – 5:00 PM) - Channel Islands Maritime Museum, 3900 Bluefin Circle, Oxnard, CA 93035

#### Meeting Objectives

- Receive targeted informational presentations
- Discuss and complete MSWG advice package to Sanctuary Advisory Council

#### Meeting Agenda

Time	Item	Lead
9:30 am	Arrivals	
10:00 am	Welcome, Introductions, Meeting Objectives, and Agenda Review	• MSWG Co-Chairs, Facilitators
10:15 am	Informational Presentations <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Stephanie Altman: IMO Process</li><li>• Sarah Gonyo: NOAA's economic studies</li><li>• Jessica Redfern: parameters for whale impact analysis</li></ul>	• Stephanie Altman, NOAA • Sarah Gonyo, NOAA • Jessica Redfern, NOAA
11:40 am	Discuss and complete MSWG advice package <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Outreach/education advice</li><li>• Research advice</li><li>• Advice on management measures in general</li></ul>	• All
12:05 pm	Public comment	• Public
12:15 pm	Lunch Break	Lunch provided on site
1:00 pm	(Cont.) Discuss and complete MSWG advice package <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Two proposals<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Technology-based approach</li><li>○ Spatial management options</li></ul></li></ul>	• All
2:30 pm	Afternoon Break & Museum Tour	Museum staff
2:50 pm	(Cont.) Discuss and complete MSWG advice package <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Two proposals<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ Technology-based approach</li><li>○ Spatial management options</li></ul></li></ul>	• All
4:30 pm	Public comment	• Public
4:40 pm	Confirm next steps <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Final steps to confirm advice packet</li><li>• Post-process evaluation</li></ul>	• All
4:50 pm	Closing comments, reflections, and gratitude	• All
5:00 pm	Adjourn	

#### Meeting Materials

- Draft MSWG advice package
- NOAA read-ahead package on economic analyses